

28 March 1960

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, SR/2

SUBJECT : Contact Report of Meetings for Assessment and  
Recruitment Held in New York, 14-16 March 1960

1. On 14 March 1960 the undersigned case officer traveled to New York to establish contacts with two prospective agents: [ ] and Vilis HAZNERS.
2. Two visits were made on 14 March to the apartment of [ ] Brooklyn, New York. On the second visit contact was made with [ ] parents at approximately 2100 hours, 14 March. Introducing himself as [ ] (@), the undersigned learned from them that their son is currently an instructor in the Department of English at Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio. Subject has been a member of the faculty at Bowling Green since September 1959. He is not expected to return to Brooklyn until Easter. However, contact at Bowling Green will be initiated. Subject's mother exhibited a piercing and inquisitive nature towards case officer's inquiries concerning her son. Case officer stated that he was a former graduate student with an interest in Baltic affairs and that he had learned of Subject's studies in philology at Columbia University. Moreover, he explained that he wanted to discuss with her son some of his studies at Columbia. Subject's mother countered that Subject had majored in English not in Baltic languages. She allowed that if anyone were interested in Baltic languages, her husband and she were better qualified. Case officer thanked the mother for this bit of news. After receiving Subject's new address from the father, the undersigned stated that he would possibly write or try to visit Subject when he returned around Easter. Case officer departed at approximately 2115 hours.
3. From this visit it appeared that both Subject's parents apparently work by day. They are in their fifties. Their apartment consists of what appears to be a large living room and one or two bedrooms in a lower middle class section of Brooklyn. Being seemingly a hard working couple who have endured the unsettling experience of emigration the parents exhibit a pride in their surroundings and son's academic accomplishments. (The thought has occurred to the case officer that the mother might have been unduly curious about anyone's interest in her son's past studies as a result of a popularized current investigation being run by the District Attorney's Office in New York against people who have ghost written exams and graduate theses at local colleges and universities.)

4. An initial visit was made on 14 March 1960 to the home of Vilis HAZNERS, 4 Summit Street, East Orange, New Jersey, at approximately 1940 hours. Mrs. HAZNERS who answered the door stated that her husband was in Washington. She added that he would be home at the same time the following evening. Subject lives in an apartment on the 4th floor of the above address. Case officer introduced himself using his pseudonym.

5. A second visit was made to Subject's residence on 15 March 1960 at approximately 1930 hours. Subject's daughter-in-law reported that he had been unable to meet case officer by reason of a previous engagement which would occupy his time until 2400 or 0100 hours. The undersigned stated that he would return the following evening.

6. On 16 March, at approximately 0900 hours, a call was made to Headquarters apprising the Chief of the Baltic Section that more time was needed to contact Subject. Permission was granted. Subject was contacted finally by telephone at the Committee for a Free Latvia, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York, WABash 4-5880. Subject agreed to meet undersigned in the lobby of the Park Sheraton Hotel, 56th Street and 7th Avenue, New York, at 1730 hours.

7. Case Officer met Subject as prearranged. Latter responded favorably to a suggestion that we hold a private discussion in C/O's hotel room. Once inside the room C/O established his bona fides with his Agency I.D. card. The initial conversation was conducted in general terms citing the continuing United States interest in the Baltic States and an unwillingness to recognize their incorporation into the USSR. To further good rapport, C/O stated that Subject's work on behalf of Latvia had come to attention of individuals interested in Latvian affairs. With a touch of regret it was pointed out that perhaps an oversight had transpired in the past in that no one in an official government capacity had talked with Subject at any length or even at all. Moreover, the undersigned stated that it was possible that Subject could furnish the government with some useful information which would be in the common interest of aiding the cause of Latvia. While it was recognized that a war for liberation of the Baltic States was out of the question, the point was stressed that other means might be found to exploit the nationalistic spirit which many Latvians feel and demonstrate in the face of their oppressors. At this time Subject seemed ready for more concrete facts. C/O pointed out that he would like to discuss specifics, but before doing so he would have to ask the Subject to sign a Secrecy Agreement. Latter consented willingly after reading the document. Since Subject sometimes does not fully comprehend English, the C/O again stressed the meaning of the Secrecy Agreement.

8. The undersigned delineated the specific items of interest which Subject might supply. First, he was asked to provide biographic data on selected Latvian personalities that he believed to be reliable individuals of substance and integrity living outside and within the Latvian SSR; data on Latvians who were pro-Soviet or might be subject to Soviet pressures; and data on prominent Latvian Communists which might be less widely known. Secondly, Subject was oriented on the concept of legal travelers and asked to assist in furnishing leads as to likely mature individuals who might have the time, disposition and a plausible reason for visiting the Baltic region.

9. The case officer queried Subject as to whether he could identify some names that he had with him. No effort was made to further identify these names to the Subject with one exception or to profess any knowledge as to why these names were mentioned. Of some 13 names enumerated Subject stated that he did know Peteris JANESINS, formerly married to niece of Subject's wife, Feliks AUSKELIS, and a SILIS, fnu. As a trial mission, he was told to collect all data that he might have on these individuals.

10. At this time, approximately 1830 hours, the meeting in Room 1604 adjourned to the hotel dining room. During dinner conversation was directed towards learning how Subject felt about the Soviets and his understanding of Latvia today. Some discussion of his family life and work for the Committee for a Free Latvia was undertaken. It was learned that Subject's wife is a practical nurse employed at the Orange (New Jersey) Memorial Hospital. Both of his sons are students at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey, where one not identified is majoring in electrical engineering and the other in civil engineering. The youngest, VITAUTS, is married and lives at home with his wife and small child.

11. At 1945 hours the meeting adjourned once more to Room 1604 where C/O requested Subject to fill out PRQ Part I. Latter agreed readily with a few facetious remarks about the ways of bureaucracy and its multi-paged forms. C/O assisted in explaining meaning of the questions on the PRQ. After completion of this task the conversation was oriented towards a suitable time for a future meeting. Subject estimated that considering his job and proposed trips in connection with same, he would need approximately 14 days to compile information on Latvian personalities. Subject felt that it would be easier for a subsequent contact to be conducted in New York where his information is readily available. However, he did agree to come to Washington, if necessary. Since Subject can write better in the Latvian language, it was agreed that his information would be acceptable in that form. He did not object to using a dictaphone whereby he could translate from Latvian and dictate in English. Where he has difficulty in expressing English meanings, it was observed by C/O that Russian could be used to advantage to clarify some ideas.

12. Subject was furnished with following address:

[ ]

He was directed to write an innocuous letter to this address stating when he would be ready for re-contact regarding information that he agreed to compile. Subject was told to give specific dates when he could be reached in New York and dates when he might be available to come to Washington. He would be notified by this office via a person-to-person phone call to his residence if necessary or by mail if time permits when we plan to meet him.

13. The following telephone number was furnished to Subject:

[ ]  
Executive 3-4896

He was instructed not to use this number except in emergency when a sudden last minute change in meeting might arise, and communication by mail was precluded. His calls would be reimbursed when authorized by this office.

14. The matter of Subject contacting [ ] by phone whenever he visits Washington on business trips for his office was discussed. The undersigned stated that this method of contact was not acceptable unless absolutely necessary. Subject was informed that he might compromise his contact with this office should meetings be arranged while he is traveling with colleagues from his office. It was indicated that someone might recognize the case officer or someone else meeting with Subject. The idea of compartmentation as a basic principle of security was stressed. Subject accepted the explanation for being security conscious at all times.

15. After re-emphasizing the importance of the Secrecy Agreement and the fact that his contact with this office should be discussed with no one, the meeting was concluded. Subject departed at approximately 2115 hours.

[ ]  
SR/2/Baltic/Latvia

SECRET